hep-th/9811121
UB-ECM-PF 98/24
INFN-RM3 98/8
DFTT 65/98

Realization of symmetries and the c–theorem

Stefano Forte[a]* and José I. Latorre[b]

[a] *I.N.F.N., Sezione di Roma III*
Via della Vasca Navale 84, I-00146 Rome, Italy

[b] *Departament d'Estructura i Constituents de la Matèria,*
Universitat de Barcelona
and *I.F.A.E.,*
Diagonal 647, E-08028 Barcelona, Spain

arXiv:hep-th/9811121v1 13 Nov 1998

Abstract

We discuss the relation between the c–theorem and the the way various symmetries are realized in quantum field theory. We review our recent proof of the c–theorem in four dimensions. Based on this proof and further evidence, we conjecture that the realization of chiral symmetry be irreversible, flowing from the Wigner-Weyl realization at short distance to the Nambu–Goldstone realization at long distance. We argue that three apparently independent constraints based on the renormalization group, namely anomaly matching, the c–theorem and the conjectured symmetry realization theorem, are particular manifestations of a single underlying principle.

Presented by J.I.L. at the
Faro Workshop on Exact Renormalization Group
September 10-12, 1998.

to be published in the proceedings

November 1998

* On leave from INFN, Sezione di Torino, Italy

1. Introduction

The c–theorem expresses a deep property of the renormalization group (RG), namely the irreversibility of its flows for unitary quantum field theories. This irreversibility is proven by explicitly exhibiting an observable function (c–function) which is monotonically decreasing along RG trajectories. The theorem, originally discovered [1] in a two-dimensional setting, has been subsequently analyzed from a variety of viewpoints [2-11], and recently generalized to four dimensions [12], along a suggestion of ref. [2], by means of techniques which encompass much of the previous effort.

This recent result leads naturally to examining the way symmetries are realized along RG trajectories. Indeed, the decrease, proven in ref. [12], of the c–function proposed in ref. [2] is supported by several explicit examples, where it is a consequence of the fact that massless degrees of freedom tend to be bosonic in the infrared limit. This suggests that the c–theorem may be related to the way chiral symmetry is realized along the RG trajectory, i.e. that the RG takes from Wigner-Weyl to Nambu-Goldstone realizations when flowing from high to low energy.

In the sequel, we will formulate more precisely this idea, and conjecture that chiral symmetry realization be similarly governed by an irreversibility theorem, and thus constrained by general principles such as unitarity. More in general, we will suggest that the c–theorem is a particular case of an underlying algebra of scale and axial currents, whose Ward identities govern the ways various symmetries are realized. Anomaly matching, the c–theorem, the Goldstone theorem and its flow are then different manifestations of a single deeper principle. The physical mechanism ultimately responsible for such a remarkable fact appears to be the decoupling of positive-norm massive states from the Hilbert space as one flows towards the infrared. Different constraints are then derived, depending on the Ward identity which is being considered, and thus on the relevant intermediate states.

A proof of this conjecture may provide a significant step in relating renormalization group ideas to the concept of entropy in quantum field theory.

2. Proving the c–theorem

In a seminal paper [1], Zamolodchikov proved that an observable quantity $c\left(g^i, \mu\right)$ based on correlators of the energy–momentum tensor of a two dimensional, Poincaré invariant, renormalizable and unitary theory obeys an irreversible renormalization group equation

$$-\beta^i \frac{\partial}{\partial g^i} c(g^j, \mu) \leq 0 \ , \tag{2.1}$$

where μ is the renormalization scale (subtraction point). It is then clear that RG flows are irreversible since eq. (2.1) entails an ordering of theories along scales. Loosely speaking, the theorem states that a net loss of information is taking place when we move towards the infrared.

Though we will not enter the details of the proof, it is worth emphasizing some of its key features:

i) The c–function is constructed from the energy-momentum tensor. This is the only operator in a quantum field theory which is guaranteed to exist and whose properties are always known since it is a descendant of the identity. Furthermore, its anomalous dimension vanishes, thus simplifying the analysis.

ii) The c–function is additive: the contributions to it from two sets of non-interacting degrees of freedom simply add up. This property suggests that the c–function counts massless effective degrees of freedom in the Hilbert space.

iii) The proof is based on trading two scales. The variation of energy–momentum tensor correlators upon a change of μ (the subtraction point) is traded with their flow upon variation of x (the space separation in a two–point energy–momentum tensor correlator). Ward identities for the conservation of the energy–momentum tensor bring information on the change in x and turn to be sufficient to prove that the variation of c is proportional to the correlator of two traces of the energy–momentum tensor.

iv) Unitarity is at the origin of irreversibility.

The treatment of the two-dimensional case is dramatically simplified by the absence of spin structures in correlators of energy–momentum tensors. In more than two dimensions, the role of the change of scale generator is taken by spin 0, whereas the form of Green function at finite distances in conformal field theories is governed by spin 2.

The two–dimensional proof of the c–theorem can be recast in terms of spectral densities [4], making apparent the role of positive–norm intermediate states, and thus of unitarity which guarantees this positivity. In this approach, the c–function is a measure of the massless intermediate degrees of freedom in the correlator of two energy–momentum tensors, and its decrease is due to the decoupling of modes as the scale is lowered.

The road to the generalization of the c–theorem to higher dimensions was initiated by Cardy [2], then pursued by a number of groups [3,4,5], on the basis of the observation that the central charge of a $d = 2$ conformal field theory is responsible for both the coefficient of the two-point correlator of the energy-momentum tensors and for the trace anomaly θ on a curved background. In general, in $d = 2n$ dimensions, the trace anomaly appears both in $n + 1$–vertex graphs, and in the one-point function $\langle\theta\rangle$. The RG flow of these Green functions can then again be studied by trading scales. In two dimensions, we may trade the subtraction point with the space separation of the two–point correlator, or with the curvature scale of the one-point function. In four dimensions, one possibility is to work with three-point functions; in order to keep the analysis manageable one could then choose a symmetric geometry and deal with a single overall scale factor. The alternative, easier option is to study the variation of the curvature scale in the one-point function. The argument has then the additional advantage of naturally generalizing to arbitrary even dimension.

The proof of the c–theorem of ref. [12] is based on this line of thought [2][4]: one starts with a slight modification of Cardy's proposal for a c–function, namely the vacuum-expectation value of the trace of the energy–momentum tensor on a hyperbolic background with constant curvature $R = -a^2 d(d-1)$:

$$c\left(\frac{\mu}{a}, g^i\right) \equiv \frac{a^{-d} V}{A_d} \langle \theta \rangle \ , \tag{2.2}$$

where V is the volume of the $(d-1)$–dimensional sphere and A_d is a suitable normalization factor. This c–function obeys a renormalization group equation with vanishing anomalous dimension:

$$\mu \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\mu} c\left(\frac{\mu}{a}, g^i\right) = \left(\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} + \beta^i(g) \frac{\partial}{\partial g^i}\right) c\left(\frac{\mu}{a}, g^i\right) = 0 \ . \tag{2.3}$$

The dependence on the subtraction point is then traded for the dependence on the curvature a, whose variations are generated by

$$\delta_s \equiv a \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}a} = -2 \int \mathrm{d}^d x \ g^{\alpha\beta}(x) \frac{\delta}{\delta g^{\alpha\beta}(x)} \ . \tag{2.4}$$

The effect of a scale transformation δ_s is dictated by the scale Ward identity [13-14]

$$-2 g^{\alpha\beta}(x) \frac{\delta}{\delta g^{\alpha\beta}(x)} \langle \mathcal{O}(y) \rangle = -\nabla_\mu \langle j_D^\mu(x) \mathcal{O}(y) \rangle + \delta^{(d)}(x-y) \langle \delta_s \mathcal{O}(y) \rangle + \langle \theta(x) \mathcal{O}(y) \rangle \ , \tag{2.5}$$

where only the last term on the r.h.s., namely the insertion of the trace of the energy-momentum tensor, is a non-contact contribution. Note that only contributions to θ proportional to the beta functions can contribute to this term unless $\mathcal{O}$ is proportional to the identity operator, because the remaining contributions to θ are proportional to the identity, and the correlator only includes connected contributions.

Identifying the operator $\mathcal{O}$ with that which appears in the definition of the c–function eq. (2.2), all contact terms cancel in eq. (2.5), and we are led to

$$-\beta^i \partial_i c = -\frac{1}{V} \int \mathrm{d}^d x \ \sqrt{g(x)} \langle \theta_{dyn}(x) \theta_{dyn}(0) \rangle_s \leq 0 \ , \tag{2.6}$$

where θ_{dyn} is the sum of the contributions to the trace of the energy–momentum tensor which are proportional to the beta-functions and the subscript s indicates that the correlator is free of contact terms. The irreversibility of the flow follows from the positivity of the correlator on r.h.s. of eq. (2.6), which in turn can be proven for unitary theories by means of a spectral representation.

The physical interpretation of the c–theorem is conceptually similar to that of its two-dimensional incarnation discussed previously: massive, positive–norm intermediate states in the correlator $\langle \theta\theta \rangle$ decouple in the infrared, and this produces irreversibility of RG flows. The proof is done at the level of Hilbert space states, so in the above statement no reference is implied to the fields which define the ultraviolet theory.

The main subtlety in the proof is related to the absence of contact terms on the r.h.s. of eq. (2.6), which is crucial in establishing that its sign is negative semi-definite. This is closely related to the issue of renormalization scheme dependence. Indeed, when perfoming a change of subtraction scheme, two modifications take place: the correlator of the two energy–momentum tensors picks a contact term proportional to $\langle\theta\rangle$ and the Ward identity acquires a contribution which exactly cancels it. The physical reason for this effect is the fact that a change of scale of c is observable and, thus, scheme independent. The above proof was presented in the particular scheme in which the Ward indentities take the form of eq. (2.5), i.e. such that the equations of motion are satisfied at the operator level by the renormalized operators.

This proof of the c–theorem, however, has some shortcomings. The most annoying one is the need to work in curved space. A more natural proof should only use properties of flat space; however it is then very likely that it should make use of three-point functions of the energy–momentum tensor. It should also be possible to get a Wilsonian proof of the c–theorem along the lines initiated in ref. [15]. This would extend the validity of the theorem to effective theories, even if not renormalizable: for instance, chiral perturbation theory looks irreversible though not renormalizable. At a deeper level, one would like to understand the c–theorem in terms of information theory, i.e. relate the c–function and its decrease to a characterization of the entropy of the system [7]. We shall come back to this last point in our conclusions.

3. Realizations of the c–theorem

On top of the formal proof [12], a considerable amount of direct evidence supports the conclusion that Cardy's c–function eq. (2.2) decreases along RG flows. In fact, it was already proven in ref. [2] that the c–function decreases to first non–trivial order in conformal perturbation theory. Notice that this includes all the flows around any fixed point, gaussian or not. Furthermore, the inequality $c_{UV} - c_{IR} \geq 0$ can be checked explicitly in several cases.

A striking instance is in supersymmetric gauge theories, where the desired inequality is fulfilled by an overwhelming number of exactly known realizations [16,17,18]. A representative example is the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory with $SU(N_c)$ color gauge group and N_f flavors in the fundamental representation. The ultraviolet c–charge is [16]

$$c_{UV} = (N_c^2 - 1)c_V + 2N_f N_c c_S \ , \tag{3.1}$$

where the charges for a vector and a scalar supermultiplet are computed by adding those of their components and found to be $c_V = 135$ and $c_S = 15$. According to the exact solution of ref. [19], we get

$N_f = 0$	$c_{IR} = 0$ (massgap)
$0 < N_f < N_c$	no vacuum
$N_f = N_c$	$c_{IR} = \left(N_f^2 + 1\right) c_S$

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
N_f = N_c + 1 & c_{IR} = \left(N_f^2 + 2N_f\right) c_S \\
N_c + 2 \leq N_f < \frac{3}{2} N_c & c_{IR} = \left((N_f - N_c)^2 - 1\right) c_V + \left((3N_f - 2N_c) N_f\right) c_S \\
\frac{3}{2} N_c = N_f & c_{IR} = \left(\frac{N_c^2}{4} - 1\right) + \frac{15}{4} N_c^2 c_S
\end{array}
$$

So $c_{UV} < c_{IR}$ always. The same test can be performed with gauge groups $SO(N_c)$, $Sp(2N_c)$, G_2 and choosing different representations for the matter fields. The analysis can also be carried through for theories with non-trivial infrared realizations in a systematic and exhaustive way [17], and its result likewise supports the theorem.

A particular case of obvious interest is that of QCD, already discussed by Cardy [2]. Here, the ultraviolet degrees of freedom are free fermions and vectors, whose c–charges add up to

$$c_{UV} = \left(N_c^2 - 1\right) c_v + 2 N_f N_c c_f \tag{3.2}$$

with $c_v = 62$ and $c_f = 11$. The standard infrared realization in the chiral limit, with spontaneously broken chiral symmetry, gives

$$c_{IR} = \left(N_f^2 - 1\right) c_s \ , \tag{3.3}$$

with $c_s = 1$ and does obey $c_{IR} < c_{UV}$. Notice that a Wigner-like realization of chiral symmetry with $2N_f^3$ massless baryons would instead violate the c theorem: its c–charge would be larger than the ultraviolet one.

Note furthermore that the r.h.s. in eq. (2.6) is proportional to the square of the beta–function. It is thus easy to see that in the large N_c limit the derivative of c contain terms of the form

$$\dot{c} \sim \ \langle \theta\theta \rangle \sim a N_c^2 + b N_c N_f + c N_f^2 \ . \tag{3.4}$$

The first two types of terms have the structure needed to remove the corresponding contributions to c_{UV} whereas the last leads to the value of c_{IR} associated to the pions. It is curious to observe that the factor 11 which appears in the beta–function matches the value of the c–charge coming from the trace anomaly. The c–theorem might provide a connection between these coefficients.

4. The trace anomaly and the axial anomaly

The c–theorem, which provides a constraint on short– *vs.* long–distance realizations of quantum field theories, appears to be intimately connected to the trace anomaly. A different set of constraints, the 't Hooft anomaly matching conditions, are instead related to the axial anomaly. Axial and trace anomalies are characterized at fixed points by coefficients (charges) that multiply topological terms. The behavior of these charges under RG transformations is not the same: axial anomalies are protected by the Adler-Bardeen non-renormalization theorem and thus scale–independent, whereas the trace anomaly scales in an irreversible way. There is however a close kinship between axial and conformal symmetries and the respective anomalies.

Indeed, consider the chiral Ward identity [20] associated to the chiral variation $\delta_5\psi = i\gamma_5\psi$ of the fermion fields ψ: this has the same form as the conformal Ward identity eq. (2.5), except that the l.h.s. (which is due to transformation of the space–time coordinates) vanishes since the axial symmetry is an internal symmetry:

$$0 = -\nabla_\mu \langle j_5^\mu(x)\mathcal{O}(y)\rangle + \delta^{(d)}(x-y)\langle\delta_5\mathcal{O}(y)\rangle + \langle\partial_\mu j_5^\mu\mathcal{O}(y)\rangle \ . \tag{4.1}$$

The last term on the r.h.s. of eq. (4.1) is the sum of a classical chiral symmetry breaking term (proportional to the fermion mass m_ψ) and an axial anomaly $\mathcal{A}(x)$:

$$\partial_\mu j_5^\mu = 2im_\psi\bar\psi\gamma_5\psi + \mathcal{A}. \tag{4.2}$$

Now, it is interesting to consider various possibilities for the way chiral symmetry is realized; these can be studied by considering various choices for the operator $\mathcal{O}$ in eq. (4.1). First, consider the case in which the axial symmetry is broken by an anomaly, and take $\mathcal{O}$ proportional to the identity operator. In the absence of massless excitations we are then left with

$$0 = 2i\langle m_\psi\bar\psi\gamma_5\psi\rangle + \langle\mathcal{A}\rangle. \tag{4.3}$$

As is well known [20], the first term on the r.h.s. of eq. (4.3) is equal to (twice) the number of right-handed minus left-handed zero-modes of the Dirac operator: the zero modes are thus counted by the anomaly, which must match them exactly in order to produce the desired cancellation in eq. (4.3) (index theorem).

Furthermore, we may study the scale dependence of either of the two terms on the r.h.s. of eq. (4.3) by taking the operator $\mathcal{O}$ in the conformal Ward identity (2.5) proportional to it: if we take in particular

$$\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_5 \equiv 2iNm_\psi\bar\psi\gamma_5\psi, \tag{4.4}$$

with N a normalization factor chosen in such a way that $\mathcal{O}$ is dimensionless, we get

$$\delta_{scale}\langle N\mathcal{A}\rangle = -\delta_{scale}\mathcal{O}_5 = -\int\langle\left[2iNm_\psi\bar\psi\gamma_5\psi\right]\theta\rangle = 0. \tag{4.5}$$

The last step follows from the fact that there are no intermediate states that couple to both θ and $\bar\psi\gamma_5\psi$, as it is apparent recalling [14] that the fermion contribution to θ is proportional to $\bar\psi\psi$. It follows that there is no flow for the anomaly: the axial anomaly must exactly match in high– and low–energy theories.

The relation between the RG flows of the scale and axial anomalies can be pursued at the level of spectral representations. Whereas the monotonic nature of the former flow can be related to the decoupling of massless modes towards the infrared, the lack of flow of the latter is reflected in the fact that the spectral representation for the axial anomaly satisfies a sum rule which relates its infrared and ultraviolet behaviors [21]. Indeed, the anomaly $\mathcal{A}$ can be computed from the ultraviolet behavior of the fermion spectrum, whereas the index theorem eq. (4.3) relates it to the number of zero modes. Since for supersymmetric theories the axial and conformal current belong to the same supermultiplet, it is suggestive to conjecture that both the anomaly matching and the c–theorem may be manifestations

of the algebra of this supercurrent, whereby commuting the scale current with either the scale or chiral current generates scale transformations of the respective anomalies.

The set of algebraic conditions is then completed by studying the commutator of the axial current with itself. This corresponds to considering chiral variations of a chiral operator such as $\mathcal{O}_5$ eq. (4.4). The ensuing chiral Ward identities are rather complex in the general case in which both the anomaly and a fermion mass are present (see for instance ref. [22] for recent developents), but they reduce to a simple and well known case in the chiral limit and in the absence of axial anomaly (such as when the current j_5^μ is flavor non-singlet):

$$0 = -\nabla_\mu \langle j_5^\mu(x)\mathcal{O}_5(y)\rangle + \delta^{(d)}(x-y)\langle \delta_5 \mathcal{O}_5(y)\rangle, \tag{4.6}$$

where we are assuming that the normalization factor in eq. (4.4) is now chosen in such a way that $\mathcal{O}_5$ admits a finite chiral limit. Eq. (4.6) is just the Ward identity that leads to Goldstone's theorem [20]. Indeed, it can be satisfied in two ways: either the two terms on the r.h.s. of eq. (4.6) separately vanish, or they are equal and opposite. In the latter case the vacuum breaks chiral symmetry, and there must exist massless particles with the quantum numbers of $\mathcal{O}_5$. So the two options correspond to chiral symmetry being realized in the Wigner or Goldstone mode respectively. This now suggests that one may further pursue the study of the algebra of chiral and scale currents by looking at the scale dependence of Goldstone's theorem. We will do this in the next section.

5. Irreversibility of the realization of chiral symmetry

Most of the examples presented as evidence for the c–theorem based on Cardy's c–function share the remarkable property of displaying a Goldstone realization of some flavor symmetry at long distances. Indeed, the checks are performed verifying that $c_{UV} \leq c_{IR}$: this is possible because the realizations of the flavor symmetry are known at both endpoints of the RG flow, and turn out to be free theories at those points. For instance, QCD is a theory of free massless quarks and gluons (strictly non-interacting right at the fixed-point) in the UV and a theory of free massless pions (in the chiral limit) in the IR.

The key observation is then that free massless bosons, fermions and vectors weight, according to the trace anomaly, as

$$c_b = 1 \qquad c_f = 11 \qquad c_v = 62\ . \tag{5.1}$$

These numbers encode some deep, basic property of quantum field theory. For instance, considering the above values together with those given by the coefficient proportional to the Weyl tensor in the trace anomaly (1 for bosons, 6 for fermions and 12 for vectors) immediately implies the impossibility of a trivial bosonization in $d = 4$. Moreover, massless bosons are favored in the infrared in the sense that their weight in the c–charge is smaller than the ones of fermions and vectors: the c–theorem, then, generates a constraint on which infrared massless modes may describe the system, and in particular favours the Goldstone realization of chiral symmetry over the Wigner-Weyl realization. Indeed, there are no

known examples in which once a Nambu–Goldstone realization is obtained, a Wigner-Weyl realization is recovered at lower energy.

This leads to conjecture a property of irreducibility for chiral symmetry realizations. Consider for example the case of QCD. As we have seen in the end of the last section, whether chiral symmetry is realized in the Goldstone or Wigner mode hinges on whether the two terms on the r.h.s. of eq. (4.6) vanish or not. In order to study the scale dependence of symmetry realization it is thus sufficient to study the scale dependence of the expectation value $\langle \mathcal{O}_c \rangle$ of the chiral order parameter

$$\mathcal{O}_c \equiv \delta_5 \mathcal{O}_5. \tag{5.2}$$

But this is just given by the Ward identity eq. (2.5): if the order parameter is dimensionless and observable, from it follows the analogue of eq. (2.6), namely

$$-\beta^i \partial_i \langle \mathcal{O}_c \rangle = -\frac{1}{V} \int \mathrm{d}^d x \ \sqrt{g(x)} \langle \theta_{dyn}(x) \mathcal{O}_c \rangle_s. \tag{5.3}$$

If the correlator on the r.h.s. of eq. (5.3) can be proven to be positive definite, then the realization of chiral symmetry is irreversible: if the order parameter moves away from zero it can never go back to zero. This means that as soon as chiral symmetry is spontaneously broken, it remains broken at any lower scale. Irreversibility is once again related to the decoupling of positive–norm (unitarity) intermediate states, now from the r.h.s. of eq. (5.3).

A formal proof of this result presents several technical complications. The most notable is related to the way the chiral limit is approached: either we stay away from the limit, in which case we must deal with a more complicated form of the chiral Ward identity, or we are at the limit, in which case the definition of the operator (4.4) is nontrivial. Also, even though the operator $\mathcal{O}_c$ is proportional to the fermionic contribution to θ, the correlator on the r.h.s. of eq. (5.3) is not manifestly a square, and thus it is not manifestly positive. Therefore, for the time being we present the irreversibilty of the realization of chiral symmetry as a conjecture, which we expect to hold for some choice of the chiral order parameter $\mathcal{O}_c$, not necessarily identical to that of eq. (5.2)-(4.4).

Indeed, an alternative option is to choose a many–point function as a chiral order parameter: in such case we can then dispense with the need to deal with curved space, since we may use the momentum transfer as a scale. A natural candidate is based on a VV-AA correlator:[23-24]

$$\Pi^{\mu\nu}_{LR}(q) \equiv 2\mathrm{i} \int d^4x \ \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}qx} \ \langle 0 | T \left(L^\mu(x) R^\nu(0)^\dagger \right) | 0 \rangle \ , \tag{5.4}$$

where

$$R^\mu, L^\mu = \bar{d} \gamma^\mu \frac{1}{2} \left(1 \pm \gamma_5 \right) u(x) \ . \tag{5.5}$$

Extracting the Lorentz structure according to

$$\Pi^{\mu\nu}_{LR}(q) \equiv \left(q^\mu q^\nu - g^{\mu\nu} q^2 \right) \Pi_{LR} \left(Q^2 \right) \ , \tag{5.6}$$

with $Q^2 = -q^2$, we may take as a chiral order parameter the function $F(Q^2)$ defined by

$$F\left(Q^2\right) \equiv -Q^2 \Pi_{LR}\left(Q^2\right). \tag{5.7}$$

Indeed, $F(Q^2)$ is zero in perturbation theory, while at long distances chiral perturbation theory gives

$$F\left(Q^2\right) = f_\pi^2 + 4L_{10}Q^2 + \ldots. \tag{5.8}$$

The RG flow $F(Q^2)$ can then be studied by trading its scale dependence for the dependence on its argument Q^2. Available knowledge on $F(Q^2)$ [23,24] seems to support its irreversibility; a formal proof, however is nontrivial. It is interesting to observed that if the irreversibility were proven, then the ordering of resonances in the large N_c limit would be strongly constrained [24].

6. RG flows and information theory

The ultimate understanding of irreversibility of RG flows must be rooted in information theory. This, however, is only well–understood at the classical level, where Shannon's entropy provides a quantitative measure of our lack of information of a system. Its quantum counterpart is based on von Neumann's entropy associated to a density matrix. One feature of entropy in quantum mechanics which appears to be relevant here is the fact that, given a system with several subsystems, entropy increases upon subtracing over one of them. This leads directly to the renormalization group, for a RG transformation can be viewed as a trace over degrees of freedom which encompasses a loss of information.

However, promoting von Neumann's ideas to quantum field theory is not obvious [7]. To begin with, several definitions of entropy are available, not all of which are simply related to the original quantum mechanical one. One of these definitions, namely the geometric entropy [25], does have the property of increasing upon subtracing a system. In two dimensions the change of this entropy with respect to the variation of an infrared scale can be shown to be related to the trace of the energy–momentum tensor and thus to the c–charge. It is tempting to guess that such a description might provide a deeper understanding of the c–theorem.

Acknowledgments J.I.L. thanks M. Asorey, M. Knecht, C. Korthas-Altes, C. A. Lütken, H. Osborn, E. de Rafael, and G. Shore for many fruitful discussions. Financial support from CIRIT (contract 1996GR00066) is also acknowledged.

References

[1] A. B. Zamolodchikov, JETP Lett. **43** (1986) 730.

[2] J. L. Cardy, Phys. Lett. **B215** (1988) 749.

[3] H. Osborn, Phys. Lett. **B222** (1989) 97;
I. Jack and H. Osborn, Nucl. Phys. **343** (1990) 647.

[4] A. Cappelli, D. Friedan and J.I. Latorre, Nucl. Phys. **B352** (1991) 616.

[5] G. M. Shore, Phys. Lett. **B253** (1991) 380; **B256** (1991) 407.

[6] A.H. Castro Neto and E. Fradkin, Nucl.Phys. **B400** (1993) 525; cond-mat/9301009.

[7] J. Gaite and D. O'Connor, Phys. Rev **D54** (1996) 5163; hep-th/9511090;
J. Gaite, hep-th/9810107.

[8] A. Cappelli, J. I. Latorre and X. Vilasís-Cardona, Nucl. Phys. **B376** (1992) 510; hep-th/9109041.

[9] D. Z. Freedman, J. I. Latorre and X. Vilasís-Cardona, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A6** (1991) 531.

[10] J. I. Latorre and H. Osborn, Nucl. Phys. **B511** (1998) 737; hep-th/9703196.

[11] E. Álvarez and C. Gómez, hep-th/9810102.

[12] S. Forte and J. I. Latorre, hep-th/9805015, **B511** (1998) 737.

[13] C. Callan, S. Coleman and R. Jackiw, Ann. of Phys. **59** (1970) 42

[14] J. C. Collins, A. Duncan and S. D. Joglekar, *Phys. Rev.* **D16** (1977) 438;
N. K. Nielsen, *Nucl. Phys.* **B120** (1977) 212;
R. Tarrach, *Nucl. Phys.* **B196** (1982) 45.

[15] G. Zumbach, Nucl.Phys. **B413** (1994) 754; Phys. Lett. **A190** (1994) 225;
J. Generowicz, C. Harvey-Fros, T. R. Morris, Phys. Lett. **B407** (1997) 27; hep-th/9705088;
P. Haagensen *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B323** (1994) 330; hep-th/9310032.

[16] F. Bastianelli, Phys. Lett. **B369** (1996) 249; hep-th/9511065.

[17] D. Anselmi, J. Erlich, D. Z. Freedman, A. Johansen; hep-th/9711035;
D. Anselmi, D. Z. Freedman, M. T. Grisaru, A. A. Johansen; hep-th/9708042.

[18] H. Osborn and D. Z. Freedman, Phys. Lett. **B432** (1998) 353; hep-th/9804101.

[19] N. Seiberg, Phys. Rev **D49** (1994) 6857; hep-th/9402044;
N. Seiberg, Phys. Lett **B435** (1995) 129; hep-th/9411149;
K. Intriligator and N. Seiberg, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **45BC** (1996) 1; hep-th/9509066.

[20] S. Coleman, *Aspects of Symmetry*, (Cambridge, Cambridge, U.K., 1985);
R. Jackiw, in S. B. Treiman *et al.*, *Current Algebra and Anomalies* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1985).

[21] D. Boyanovsky and R. Blankenbecler, Phys. Rev. **D31** (1985) 3234.

[22] G. Shore and G. Veneziano, Nucl. Phys. **B 381** (1992) 23.

[23] E. Witten, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51** (1983) 2351.

[24] M. Knecht and E. de Rafael, Phys.Lett. **B424** (1998) 335; hep-ph/9712457;
M. Knecht, S. Peris and E. de Rafael, hep-ph/9809594.

[25] C. Holzhey, F. Larsen and F. Wilzek, Nucl. Phys. **B424** (1994) 443; hep-th/9403108.